

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO/ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR/ PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09319136	11/29/99	BARANHOS, BACCALÀ ET AL	10314
EXAMINER			
CLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850		Jeffrey S. Parkin	
ART UNIT		PAPER	
1648		03232010	

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

37 C.F.R. § 1.98

This letter is in response to the communication filed 02 March, 2010. The information disclosure statements originally filed 02 June, 1999, and 29 December, 1999, (copies of which were submitted in the most recent communication) have been placed in the application file and the information referred to therein has been considered. Applicants are reminded the original IDSs were not considered because they failed to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. Applicants are further advised that each information disclosure statement must further include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 C.F.R. § 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information listed that is not in the English language. The concise explanation may be either separate from the specification or part of the specification. If the concise explanation is part of the specification, the IDS listing should include the page(s) or line(s) numbers where the concise explanation is located in the specification. The requirement for a concise explanation of relevance is limited to information that is not in the English language. The explanation required is limited to the relevance as understood by the individual designated in 37 C.F.R. § 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information at the time the information is submitted to the Office. If a complete translation of the

information into English is submitted with the non-English language information, no concise explanation is required. An English-language equivalent application may be submitted to fulfill this requirement if it is, in fact, a translation of a foreign language application being listed in an information disclosure statement. There is no requirement for the translation to be verified. Submission of an English language abstract of a reference may fulfill the requirement for a concise explanation. Where the information listed is not in the English language, but was cited in a search report or other action by a foreign patent office in a counterpart foreign application, the requirement for a concise explanation of relevance can be satisfied by submitting an English-language version of the search report or action which indicates the degree of relevance found by the foreign office. This may be an explanation of which portion of the reference is particularly relevant, to which claims it applies, or merely an "X", "Y", or "A" indication on a search report. The requirement for a concise explanation of non-English language information would not be satisfied by a statement that a reference was cited in the prosecution of a United States application which is not relied on under 35 U.S.C. § 120. If information cited or submitted in a prior application relied on under 35 U.S.C. § 120 was not in English, a concise explanation of the relevance of the information to the new application is not required unless the relevance of the information differs from its relevance as explained in the prior application. The concise explanation may indicate that a particular figure or paragraph of the patent or publication is relevant to the claimed invention. It might be a simple statement pointing to similarities between the item of information and the claimed invention. It is permissible but not necessary to discuss differences between the cited information and the claims. However, see *Semiconductor Energy Laboratory Co. v. Samsung Electronics Co.*, 204 F.3d 1368, 1376, 54 USPQ2d 1001, 1007 (Fed. Cir. 2000) ("[A]lthough MPEP Section 609A(3) allows the applicant some discretion in the manner in which it phrases its concise explanation, it nowhere authorizes the applicant to intentionally omit altogether key teachings of the reference."). In *Semiconductor Energy Laboratory*, patentee during prosecution submitted an untranslated 29-page Japanese reference as well as a concise explanation of its relevance and an existing one-page partial English translation, both of which were directed to less material portions of the reference. The untranslated portions of the Japanese reference "contained a more complete combination of the elements claimed [in the patent] than anything else before the PTO." 204 F.3d at 1376, 54 USPQ2d at 1005. The patentee, whose native language was Japanese, was held to have understood the materiality of the reference. "The duty of candor does not require that the applicant translate every foreign reference, but only that the applicant refrain from submitting partial translations and concise explanations that it knows will misdirect the examiner's attention from the reference's relevant teaching." 204 F.3d at 1378, 54 USPQ2d at 1008. Although a concise explanation of the relevance of the information is not required for English language information, applicants are encouraged to provide a concise explanation of why the English-language information is being submitted and how it is understood to be relevant. Concise explanations (especially those which point out the relevant pages and lines) are helpful to the Office, particularly where documents are lengthy and complex and applicant is aware of a section that is highly relevant to

patentability or where a large number of documents are submitted and applicant is aware that one or more are highly relevant to patentability.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jeffrey S. Parkin, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0908. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 10:30 AM to 9:00 PM. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick J. Nolan, can be reached at (571) 272-0847. Direct general status inquiries to the Technology Center 1600 receptionist at (571) 272-1600. Informal communications may be submitted to the Examiner's RightFAX account at (571) 273-0908.

Applicants are reminded that the United States Patent and Trademark Office (Office) requires most patent related correspondence to be: a) faxed to the Central FAX number (571-273-8300) (updated as of July 15, 2005), b) hand carried or delivered to the Customer Service Window (now located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314), c) mailed to the mailing address set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.1 (e.g., P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450), or d) transmitted to the Office using the Office's Electronic Filing System. This notice replaces all prior Office notices specifying a specific fax number or hand carry address for certain patent related correspondence. For further information refer to the Updated Notice of Centralized Delivery and Facsimile Transmission Policy for Patent Related Correspondence, and Exceptions Thereto, 1292 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 186 (March 29, 2005).

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Respectfully,

/Jeffrey S. Parkin/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1648

23 March, 2010

